

#7/Election
Shahed
5-16-02

DOCKET NO.: SC11259ZC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S)	Shun-Meen Kuo	GROUP ART UNIT:	2827
APPLN. NO.:	09/684,576	EXAMINER:	Luan c. Thai
FILED:	October 6, 2000		
TITLE:	ELECTRONIC COMPONENT AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE		

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office.

on

May 15, 2002

Signature

V. Lynn Webb

Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENTAssistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This paper is in response to the restriction requirement in the Office
Action mailed April 19, 2002.

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed April 19, 2002 in which the claims of the above-identified application were subjected to a restriction requirement. The Examiner contends in the Office Action that Embodiments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as identified in the Office Action are patentably distinct species. This requirement is traversed at least for the following reasons.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that MPEP § 808.01(a) states that when there is a disclosed relationship between species (as Applicants have done through the subject application, e.g. by pointing out the similarities between the various embodiments, and as is apparent because all embodiments involve the same basic elements of a substrate, a cap, electrical connections and an adhesive material), "such disclosed relation must be discussed [by the Examiner] and reasons advanced leading to the conclusion that the disclosed relation does not prevent restriction, in order to establish the propriety of

FAX COPY RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

restriction." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to do this. Rather, the Examiner merely indicates that two species are claimed and therefore restriction is required.

Furthermore, Applicant's disagree with the Examiner's breakdown of the embodiments. First, Embodiment 2 apparently should that of FIGs. 7-10, not FIGs. 7-19 as stated in the Office Action. This is apparently a typographical error. Also, Applicant's submit there is no difference in Embodiments 2 and 3 as identified because no claims are pending which identify the adhesive material and electrically conductive material as being unitary. Only height differences between the two materials are claimed.

Notwithstanding Applicants' above objections, Applicants have grouped the pending claims 1-25 according the Embodiments the Examiner identified as follows:

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 15-19, 24-25	Generic
Claim 5, 12, 13, 20	Embodiments 4 and 5
Claims 6, 9, 21	Embodiments 1, 2, and 3
Claim 10, 22	Embodiments 2 and 3
Claim 11, 23	Embodiment 1
Claim 14.	None

Further notwithstanding Applicants' objection, Applicants hereby elect to proceed with claims associated with Embodiment 1. Accordingly, Applicants hereby elect to proceed with prosecution of claims 1-4, 6-11, 15-19, 21, and 23-25. The remaining claims are withdrawn from consideration, but Applicants reserve the right to reinstate these claims without prejudice upon allowance of a generic claim.

Respectfully submitted,


SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.

Law Department

Customer Number: 23330

By:


Mark J. Fink

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 45,270

Telephone: 602-952-4362

Fax No.: 602-952-4376

FAX COPY RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

2

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800